

Appl. No. 10/828,993  
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 11/29/2005

### REMARKS

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-35 in the application. In a Preliminary Amendment filed with the application on April 21, 2004, the Applicant cancelled Claims 1-28. In the present response, the Applicant has amended the specification to correct an inadvertent typographical error in the specification and has amended Claims 29 and 32-35. Support for the amendment to Claim 29 include Page 4, Lines 1-8, Page 7, Lines 11-15 and Fig. 9. The amendments to Claims 32-34 correct inadvertent typographical errors made in the preliminary amendment, thereby returning the language of these claims to what was originally filed. The amendment to Claim 35 clarifies the antecedent basis of certain claim elements.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 29-31, 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,853,601 to Krishaswamy, *et al.* ("Krishaswamy").

The Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-28 are moot given that these claims were canceled in the April 21, 2004 preliminary amendment.

The Applicant maintains that Krishaswamy does not anticipate Claim 29 because no grounds have been presented for this reference teaching a plurality of openings on opposing sides of the patterned conductive layer and through the RF component at least to the semiconductor substrate, as now recited in Claim 29.

Appl. No. 10/828,993  
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 11/29/2005

Therefore, because there is no showing that Krishaswamy discloses each and every element of the claimed invention, Krishaswamy is not an anticipating reference. Because Claims 30-31, 33 and 35 are dependent upon Claim 29, Krishaswamy also cannot be an anticipating reference for these claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 29-31, 33 and 35.

## II. Rejection of Claims 3, 16, 23, 24, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13, 16, 23, 24, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishaswamy in view of Dr. Paul May (MSc Physics of Advanced Semiconductor Materials). The Examiner also rejected Claims 7, 19, 25 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishaswamy. The Examiner further rejects Claims 9 and 21, and 27 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishaswamy in view of Sherrer *et al.* U.S. Publication 2001/0050266.

Again, the Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections of claims 13, 16, 23, 24, 26 and 28; 7, 19, and 25; and 9 and 21 are moot given that these claims were canceled in the April 21, 2004 preliminary amendment.

Concerning the rejection of Claim 32, the Applicant maintains that no grounds have been presented for Krishaswamy teaching or suggesting a plurality of openings on opposing sides of the patterned conductive layer and through the RF component at least to the semiconductor substrate, as recited in Claim 29. Because there is no showing that Krishaswamy teaches or suggests all elements of independent Claims 29, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to dependent Claim 32 has not been established.

Appl. No. 10/828,993  
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 11/29/2005

### III. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent Claims 34 is allowable, if rewritten in independent form. While the Applicant appreciates this indication of allowable subject matter, as noted above, Claims 29-35 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the references of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass Claims 29-35 to issue.

### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a timely Notice of Allowance for Claims 29-35. It is not believed that any fees are due regarding this matter, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2395.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



Ronald J. Corbett

Registration No. 47,500

Dated: February 6, 2006  
P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800